

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1-6 are supported at least by Figs. 6 and 7 and the related text in the Specification.

**I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5 and 6<sup>1</sup> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proehl *et al* (US 6,477,350) [“Proehl”] in view of Lemmons (US 6,481,011) [“Lemmons”]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a program guide displaying apparatus that comprises “a table displaying device for displaying in the second display mode a second program table surrounding a plurality of program cells on a first program table displayed in the first display mode....wherein the program names within the second program table are displayed in the second display mode.”

The Examiner contends that time bar area 1012 of Proehl corresponds to a range displaying device. The Examiner also contends that step 1040 in Fig. 10 illustrates a displaying of the program range table on the first display and that step 1010 in Fig. 10 illustrates a displaying of the program range table on the second display. (Office Action at pages 5-6.)

Applicant submits that a range displaying device as originally claimed is not a time range as contended by the Examiner. However, in the interest of hastening prosecution, Applicant has clarified that claim language to read “table displaying device.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant notes that the Office Action header lists claims 1-4, but the body of the rejection has claims 1, 3, 5 and 6.

As set forth in claim 1, the claimed table display device displays, in a second display mode, a second program table surrounding a plurality of program cells on a first program table displayed in the first display mode.

An illustrative, non-limiting example of the present invention as set forth in claim 1 is shown in Fig. 6 of the present Specification. A second program table 65 surrounds a plurality of program cells 64 on a first program table 63 in the first display mode 60. The second program table is displayed in a second display mode 30.

In addition, as set forth in claim 1, “the program names within the second program table are displayed in the second display mode.”

Proehl merely discloses that the first level of EPG is displayed at step 1010 and that the EPG can be zoomed to the level at step 1040 (col. 7, lines 33-49, Fig. 10). There is no disclosure or suggestion of “displaying in the second display mode a second program table surrounding a plurality of program cells on a first program table displayed in the first display mode” or of displaying “the program names within the second program table” in the second display mode.

Applicant submits that Lemmons also does not disclose at least the “displaying in the second display mode a second program table surrounding a plurality of program cells on a first program table displayed in the first display mode” or of displaying “the program names within the second program table” in the second display mode. Therefore, Proehl and Lemmons (taken alone or in combination) do not disclose or suggest at least the claimed table displaying device as set forth in claim 1.

Claim 3 recites a program guide displaying method that comprises “a table displaying process of displaying in the second display mode a second program table surrounding a plurality

of program cells on a first program table displayed in the first display mode ... wherein the program names within the second program table are displayed in the second display mode.”

Because claim 3 recites features analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable for at least reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that claims 5 and 6 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proehl in view of Lemmons, and further in view Takahashi *et al.*, (US 6,344,880) [“Takahashi”]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that Takahashi does not disclose or suggest the claimed displaying of a second program table as described above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Accordingly, Takahashi does not cure the deficient teachings of Proehl and Lemmons given above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 4 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
Application No. 09/731,844

Attorney Docket No. Q62172

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Bhaskar Kakarla  
Registration No. 54,627

Date: August 25, 2006